



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AGLÍPAY SCHISM IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

In a paper published in a recent issue of *THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW*, I said in speaking of the Aglípay Schism:

The uncertain status of the religious life in the islands is well exhibited by the Aglípay schism. This, however, had a political as well as religious side, which of course further complicated the matter. Gregorio Aglípay, a native of one of the Iloco provinces in the north of the Island of Luzon, and a duly ordained secular priest, had attained to considerable eminence under Archbishop Nozaleda during the closing years of the Spanish regime. During the revolution against Spain, which broke out in 1896, he pursued a somewhat devious course (the whole story of which is not yet fully known), in which he played off one side against the other with considerable astuteness. Shortly after the beginning of American control, Aglípay finally split with the ecclesiastical authorities, and largely through the influence of a fellow countryman, Isabelo de los Reyes, a layman of considerable force of character, though lacking in balance, headed a new church known as the Aglípay or Independent Filipino Church. An effort was made to give the new institution a national character, which caused the government to fear that, under cover of religion, the Filipinos were plotting a new revolt against American authority. The movement spread like wildfire at first. The majority of the masses and some of the upper-class people of the two Iloco provinces joined the schism, which also numbered followers in almost all the islands in which Christianity was professed. At one time Aglípay claimed over 3,000,000 adherents, but this was doubtless a gross exaggeration. In many places, however, whole congregations of the Roman Catholic Church went over to the new sect, and other congregations were violently split apart. The schismatics attempted to take possession of the churches and other church property, but they were compelled by law to return them to their former owner, the Roman Catholic Church. At the inception of the movement Aglípay and Reyes consulted the Protestants, especially the Methodists, who had gone to the Philippines shortly after the capture of Manila, and considerable advice was received from that quarter, as well as from the Episcopalians. But the movement soon grew beyond control, and Reyes by his dominating personality gave the new church a direction that it never would have taken under the sole tutelage of Aglípay. To Reyes, in fact, are due very largely the Constitution, the so-called Bible of the Independent Filipino Church, the Catechism, and other literature published under the auspices of the new organization, much of which is a curiously puerile mass of contradictory, plagiarized, and undigested material. In his efforts to depart as far as possible from the tenets of the old Church, Reyes obligated the Aglípay Church (on paper) to a course broader in many ways than that of the most radical Unitarian Church. In real practice, however, the ceremonies of the schismatic church, except possibly in one or two instances, have never deviated in any essential from those of the Catholic Church, and the same Mass may be heard today in both churches. The Catholic Church has maintained on the whole, aside from its effort to

regain possession of its property, a laissez-faire policy in regard to the schismatic church, and it is possibly partly due to this fact that the movement has greatly died out with the return of many of its adherents to the bosom of Mother Church. But it can not be denied that the schism was a matter of deep concern to the Church, for Archbishop Harty, until quite recently the head of the Manila Diocese and of the Church in the Philippines, remarked to the writer in 1910 that it was only the Providence of God that had saved the Catholic faith in the Philippine Islands.

It might be of interest to give the story of the schism in greater detail, for in it are involved many questions of importance in the Philippine Islands, and it touches broad principles at many angles. Warning must be given at the outset, however, that final judgment can not be yet pronounced in every particular because of lack of definite information to fill in certain gaps. Events are still too recent to be known in their entirety, and the whole cannot be seen with sufficient clearness to enable one to make those broad generalizations which the historian coming after a score of years may be able to make.

The roots of the schism are not hard to find. They were in part of long standing and in part of very recent growth.¹ On the one hand are involved various religio-political questions,² and on the other, the entrance of modern ideas into the Philippines and the growth of the feeling of nationality among the Filipinos. Little can here be said of these matters as they would lead too far afield, but some general consideration must be given to them. In them is comprehended the whole friar question which was debated with avidity pro and con during the closing years of Spanish sovereignty both by Spanish and Filipino writers, and which no less has often been discussed since 1898 in our own press.

The friar question grew up almost unconsciously, yet naturally. Spain's overseas colonies reproduced in their methods of governing very largely conditions already familiar in Spain. State and Church were one and indivisible, and every ecclesiastical person, by reason of this close union, was an agent of the govern-

¹ Aglipay (*Independent*, October 29, 1903), claimed that the Independent Church was already thirty years old, but this can not be substantiated. He referred, of course, to the execution of the three Filipino priests after the suppression of the incipient insurrection of 1872. This event, however, did in a measure prepare the way for the revolt from the Church.

² Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O.P., writing in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* (April, 1905, pp. 368-381), says that the Aglipay movement was political instead of religious. Had he said that it was a combination of the religious and the political, he would have been more nearly correct.

ment. This had both strength and weakness—strength, as it allowed a consolidation of interests especially in the opening years of colonization; weakness, because it was bound in time to cause an intense internal upheaval.

In the Philippines, the Spanish Crown, enjoying the royal patronage,³ with its privileges and obligations, set about the conversion of the natives with right good will; and it can never be charged against Spain that it was faithless to the papal injunctions given in the year following Columbus's departure on his quest of discovery. In order to meet its obligations to evangelize newly discovered and occupied territory, the Crown, upon colonizing the Philippines, made use of the most readily accessible means, and this happened to be the friar organizations which already had the machinery for such an undertaking, but the intention was announced of replacing the friars as soon as possible by secular clergy. Thus the friar question came into existence.

The religious corporations, with their powerful organizations, were able to root themselves firmly in the soil and to exercise a not inconsiderable influence in public life, both governmental and social. Indeed, they became the center about which all native life revolved. Attempts to secularize the parishes in accordance with the oft-expressed injunctions of the Spanish Crown failed repeatedly, both because of the lack of a secular clergy, either Spanish or Filipino, and because of the opposition of the regular clergy, and it was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that secularization obtained even a halting start. To the end of the Spanish regime, the religious corporations exercised by far the greatest influence in the Philippines.

This influence came in time, however, to be exerted for the orders themselves, rather than for the Filipinos under their charge or for the direct interests of Spain, and the struggle of the friars became one for the preservation of power. It has often been said with considerable truth that Spain had an army in

³ By special agreement, the Spanish Crown defrayed the expenses of religion in the Philippines, as in the American colonies, in return for which it was allowed to make ecclesiastical appointments. For this reason tithes were not collected in the Philippines. The possession of this power led on more than one occasion to a clash of interests between the civil and the ecclesiastical governments. On the transfer of the Philippines to the United States, it was argued that this power became inherent in the Government of this country—a ridiculous assumption.

every friar in the Philippines. The work of the friars can scarcely be measured, and it extended in many directions. Ambition, both corporative and personal, urged the friars forward, but after they had become firmly established in the land, that ambition too often took on a material tinge from which the purely religious suffered grievously—a by no means unnatural fault for any body of men to fall into, and especially men situated as were the friars in the Philippines. Accordingly they are found doing the very things that they condemned in others. Coming in time to look upon the Philippines as peculiarly their own, they resented any interference from outside their own ranks, whether from the secular clergy or from the government. Hostile to change in the *statu quo*, they became a bar to progress and the Philippines lagged lamentably behind the rest of the world.

It must not be thought that the friars were the only cause for the backwardness of the Philippines. The civil government must shoulder its part of the blame; but it is true that had the friars desired they could have changed the conditions, as they had the greatest power in the archipelago, and almost to the end of the Spanish regime, any movement headed by them was sure of success. The progress which they failed to sanction and introduce came into the islands in spite of them and the upheaval when it came centered about them.

They failed in two very essential matters: the building up of a responsible body of Filipino clergy⁴ who could take over the parishes and thus ensure the loyalty of Filipinos to the Church and to Spain; and in guiding reforms forced through the entrance of modern ideas which came in spite of friar protest. By neglecting to satisfy the natural feeling of a people who felt that they had been unjustly treated, or to guide an ever-increasing popular

⁴ The *Catholic World* of March, 1903 (lxxvi, 851, 852), commenting on the letter to the Philippines from Pope Leo XIII in 1902, says:

"It is Rome's purpose, and it has always been the traditional policy of Rome, to insist on the cultivation of a native clergy. Over and over again has the Propaganda insisted on the open-door policy for the native priests to even the highest responsibilities. There never has been any race which as a race has been debarred from the priesthood or even the hierarchy. If any people has been called to the Catholic Church it has also been called to the responsibilities and dignities of the clerical state.

"In the history of the Catholic missions this policy has not always been followed by some of the missionaries. An oligarchic form of spiritual government has been instituted and the native has been kept in tutelage.

"Hereafter in the Philippines the native clergy must be given opportunity to advance themselves in learning and in sanctity, and consequently in places of dignity and responsibility in the Church."

demand, they failed deplorably, and they were bound to be the victims of their own failures. Because their own growth had ceased, they endeavored to stifle growth in others, failing to see that by their lack of prudence and foresight they were endangering not only their own future but the future of Spain in the Philippines. They should have learned after their long years of tutelage of the Filipinos that those people are among the easiest to guide but the most difficult to drive. By attempting the latter, they roused against themselves forces that, joined with other reasons, in the end brought about the revolt against Spain. As the government of Spain in the Philippines was constituted, the religious and the political were so closely intermingled that an attempt against one was necessarily an attempt against the other. Thus it came about that the revolt when it broke out was not un-mixed but was waged against Spain, although with hate chiefly centered upon the friar. Hence the demands for the expulsion of the orders, with some assurance that Spain would yield to these demands. The Spanish-American war prevented any such move and the transfer of sovereignty found the friars still in the islands and another nation in control of the destinies of the Filipinos. Politics began to play a larger share in the widening horizon of the Filipinos, but hostility to the friars still overtopped all other sentiments, and the schismatic church—the creature of agitation, whose watchword was resentment against the friars and which formed a part of the expression of a national life, sprang into existence, after events that had long been preparing.

Gregorio Aglipay y Labayan, from whom the schism took its name, was born in the pueblo of Batac, in the province of Ilokos Norte, May 9, 1860.⁵ His parents belonged to the peasant agricultural class, and were in moderate or even perhaps straitened circumstances. Until the age of sixteen, the young Gregorio attended the schools of his native village and aided his father with the work on the land, the chief crop of which was probably tobacco.⁶ In that year, a drought prevented the setting out

⁵ See Aglipay's own story in the *Independent* for October 29, 1903 (Vol. IV, pp. 2571-75). JOHN FOREMAN, *The Philippine Islands* (New York, Scribner's, 1906), and W. E. RETANA, *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, in *Por Esos Mundos*, April, 1908, give the date as May 7.

⁶ The tobacco industry had been a government monopoly since 1781. At the beginning it had ushered in an era of considerable economic prosperity, but long before the period of which we are treating it had become an intolerable burden on the people, and was a constant source of extortion

of the number of tobacco plants required according to the regulations of the tobacco monopoly, and in consequence both Gregorio and his father were arrested.⁷ On being released the former, partly due to this unpleasant experience and partly because his father had arranged for him a marriage not to his liking, went to Manila. There he supplemented his slender schooling with two years' study in a private school in the house of a Filipino lawyer, one Julian Carpio.⁸ This was followed by a course in the Dominican school of San Juan de Letran⁹ where he paid for his education and maintenance, in part at least, by working in the capacity of a servant. He proved an exceedingly apt pupil, and in due time was graduated in both philosophy and the arts, being regarded by his teachers with extreme favor both because of his application and his exemplary conduct. After graduation from the above institution, he entered the counciliar seminary in Bigan, in the province of Ilokos Sur, where he studied for the priesthood, and attained in time the sub-diaconate in the Diocese of Nueva Segovia.¹⁰ In 1889, he was ordained in Manila, and sang his First Mass in the church of Santa Cruz, Manila, on New Year's Day, 1890.¹¹ Entering upon his active ministry, he served successively as assistant priest in the towns of Indang, San Antonio, and Victoria, situated respectively in the provinces of Cavite, Nueva Écija, and Tarlac.¹²

When the Tagalog revolution of 1896 broke out against Spanish authority, he was stationed in the last-named town, but apparently took little or no active part in these early disturbances. So highly was he regarded in Manila, indeed, that, after the signing of the so-called pact of Biak-na-bató, by which Aguinaldo and other leaders agreed to abandon the movement, on condition of the payment of a certain sum of money by the Spanish government, to him was assigned the task of "attracting" to the government one Makabulos, who had refused to sign the pact.

and injustice. According to the government regulations by which the monopoly was controlled, each holder or owner of land was obliged to rear a certain number of plants each year and could dispose of his product only to the government at a stated price. The monopoly was finally suppressed in 1881.

⁷ See FOREMAN, and RETANA, *ut supra*.

⁸ *Ibid*. The opportunity to attend this school and to receive his later education seems to have come through a relative in Manila.

⁹ Founded in 1626 by a layman and taken in charge by the Dominicans in 1640.

¹⁰ Established as a suffragan bishopric by papal bull of 1595.

¹¹ See *Independent* and FOREMAN, *ut supra*.

¹² See FOREMAN, and RETANA, *ut supra*

The obstinate chieftain gave heed to Aglípay's representations and submitted to authority;¹³ but Aglípay himself, either because of these very negotiations or because of other actions, fell under suspicion in certain quarters. Being warned by a fellow priest that he was about to be arrested because of his liberal tendencies, of which he is said to have been admonished previously by the friars,¹⁴ he fled to Manila, where feigning illness, he was given asylum by the Canon of the Cathedral who had acted as his sponsor at the time of his ordination.¹⁵

Aglípay apparently lived quietly in Manila for some time, where he continued to hold the favor of the highest Spanish ecclesiastics and, probably through them, of the officials of the civil government as well. With the advent of the belligerent forces of the United States in Philippine waters the Filipino revolution which had never been completely suppressed, gathered new force. The Archbishop, Bernardino de Nozaleda, a Dominican, in fear lest all was lost as this new crisis appeared, sent Aglípay to carry his oft-quoted war pastoral to the Iloko provinces, in which he urged the natives to unite with the Spaniards in order by defensive warfare to repel the barbarous invader from their shores.¹⁶ From this time and for several years, Aglí-

¹³ See RETANA, *ut supra*.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Foreman seems to be considerably confused as to Aglípay's movements after he left Victoria, and although Retana's account is not altogether satisfactory, for want of a better, I am forced to rely partly upon it.

¹⁶ RETANA, *ut supra*. Probably the pastoral issued on May 6, 1898, and which was cited by Aglípay in a manifesto of March, 1899, when he portrayed the archbishop's former attitude toward the Americans with his attitude at the time of the manifesto. In it, Nozaleda said: "You must not remain ignorant of him (referring to the North Americans) who now appears before you with so much pride and who, trampling down all right, desires to impose his rule upon us. It is the foreigner who wants to subject us to his cruel yoke. It is the heretic who desires to destroy our religion and tear us from the bosom of the Catholic Church. It is the insatiable merchant who, in the midst of the ruin of Spain and her possessions, desires to swell his fortunes. . . . Poor Spain, if the invader succeeds in his designs! Poor Filipinos, the day upon which the North American establishes a stable government! Poor natives, subjugated by a people who have not the Catholic faith of Spain, nor the paternal anxiety for the good of the country, nor the high sense of honor, nor the community of interests, nor the history mingled with yours for now more than 300 years, nor the mingled blood which flows through the veins of many of you and which on a hundred glorious days has been poured out for the common defense! Brothers bound together by a common bond; sons of the metropolis and of the colonies! Very soon you will see an impassable abyss between you and your proud friends. You will have no offices nor employments, nor will you share at all in the government and the administration of the cities. You will form a class apart, you will be held vile as Pariahs, you will be exploited like convicts sent to work in a new country; you will be reduced to the condition of bondsmen and even beasts and machines; fed a handful of rice or corn which your lord will throw in your face as a daily ration so that you may not be utterly deprived of the product of your sweat, while you can enjoy the pleasure of seeing him revel in the fruits and treasures of an estate which was yours and now is his! Ah, that is not the worst. Soon you will see your temples ruined, or converted into Protestant chapels where the God of the Eucharist

pay's actions cannot be followed with anything like the definiteness desirable, but the evidence presented implies such a curious and well-managed system of duplicity that although one must condemn its author, he must admire the astuteness with which he worked. Just what were his relations with the Filipino insurgents and with the ecclesiastical hierarchy at Manila and elsewhere, it is still impossible to say. He seems for a while at least to have played off one side against the other with a skill that still baffles a complete unraveling, and it may be that the whole truth is known to no other person than to Aglipay himself.¹⁷ Not the least wonder is that he should have been given so free a hand by both sides.

He was also commissioned by the civil authorities, or by the ecclesiastical authorities with the knowledge of the former, to go to the camp of the insurgents for the purpose of entering into

(oh, what a cruel misfortune) will not be enthroned, and where the image of the Virgin Mary, our most sweet and gentle mother, will not lean in kindly fashion over you. The cross will disappear from your cemeteries, the crucifix from your schools, and from your churches the ministers of the true God who made you Christians when they baptized you, and have so many times absolved you from your sins, who united you in holy matrimony, who will be present at your last hour to console and administer the last rites of the Church, and who, after your death, will apply for the good of your soul the prayers of the Holy Church. You, with your heroic faith and valor may go on keeping your hearts as Catholic as before, even more steadfast than before, who knows? But what will happen to your dear children, your darling sons, especially if their fathers fail them, in the midst of a Protestant nation, with Protestant legislation, rites, teachings, and habits, and a free exhibition and propaganda of every vice and error? Ah, what can one expect, but that at the end of half a century, there will be neither Christian practice or Christian belief anywhere in the whole country, nor any one who makes upon his forehead the sign of the cross. Poor Filipinos, lost in this life and lost in the eternal one!" See Report of Major-General E. S. Otis, September 1, 1899 to May 5, 1900, pp. 313-316, Part II of *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1900* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1900).

Aglipay later used this pastoral with effect against the Archbishop whom he denounced in scathing terms as a turncoat and traitor who had "allied himself with the traitor Otis and the inhuman Dewey, giving them counsel and instruction and ordering his brothers, the friars, to pass praying in and through the walled city animating the enemies of our religion and country and praying to the God of battles in their behalf"; and of the friars he said: "Among these memories there is one which will always be a black spot upon our history. It is the memory of the enlightened corporations which came here to the misfortune of our most beautiful soil, not to teach us divine doctrines, but to exploit us and deprive us of our Catholic faith. The members of the above-mentioned corporations (as if God himself had interfered in events so that we should recognize them for what they are and that our eyes should be opened) not only have been wanting in all shame as to abjure their nation, but have also trampled under foot the sacred religion which they professed—a religion which served them as a shield against the consequences of their insolence. They went so far as to lick up, if you will permit the expression, the filth which they had vomited upon those who were their bitterest enemies and who are now their dearest friends"—that is the Americans. Otis, who cites this in the above report, says that "when Nozaleda summoned him to submit, he prepared and published articles severely condemning the Spanish representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and abusive of Americans, thus gaining considerable influence over that part of the population dominated by Aguinaldo." Of the manifesto, Otis declares that it exhibits Aglipay's "talent at invective."

¹⁷ Aglipay's statements regarding his actions, as given in the *Independent* of October 29, 1903, are unsatisfactory, and until he chooses to speak more openly and at greater length, the entire truth will probably not be known.

negotiations with them for the Spaniards,¹⁸ but the train in which he had started was captured at Bigáa in Bulacan province, and both he and some Spanish soldiers were taken into custody. Aglipay, however, was almost immediately released by order of the insurgent general of that district, and returned to Manila.

At this juncture, Aguinaldo returned to the Philippine Islands. He had known Aglipay well in Indang before the outbreak of the insurrection of 1896, and now seems to have lost no time in getting into touch with him again. As a result of this, Aglipay seems to have acted as a go-between for Nozaleda and Aguinaldo, accepting the confidences of both, giving neither his own complete confidence, but probably leaning more evenly and sincerely toward the insurgent side, and going and coming between Filipinos and Spaniards as he wished.¹⁹ The results obtained on either side seem to be negligible, notwithstanding Nozaleda's appeal to the Filipinos through the forces of religion.

The Americans entered Manila as victors on August 13, 1898, and Aglipay who was out of the city at the time, found his entrance barred when he attempted to return. Thereupon he turned back to the insurgent camp, where he found a ready welcome. At the advice of Mabini, the "brains of the revolution", he was appointed military chaplain of the insurgent army, and finally by decree of Aguinaldo, October 28, 1898, he was appointed vicar-general of the whole archipelago.²⁰ On the fifteenth of the fol-

¹⁸ See RETANA, *ut supra*.

¹⁹ RETANA, *ut supra*, says that Aguinaldo sent one of his generals to confer secretly with Aglipay whom he asked to raise the provinces in the northern part of Luzon in favor of the insurgents. and that Nozaleda, to whom Aglipay communicated the matter, advised acceptance, for with Aguinaldo's pass, Aglipay could have ready entrance to the insurgent camp and thus win over the Filipinos to the Spanish side; while Aguinaldo, to whom the Archbishop's advice was communicated, also counseled acceptance, for with the Archbishop's pass, Aglipay would have more opportunity to raise the northern provinces. Aglipay (*Manila Times*, January 1, 1903, and *Independent*, October 29, 1903) claimed that in the summer of 1898, the Spanish Governor-General and the Archbishop sent him to the insurgents in order to gain their cooperation against the Americans—probably the occasion upon which he carried the latter's pastoral letter. See JAMES A. LEROY, *The Americans in the Philippines* (New York, 1914), i, 318.

²⁰ Aglipay declared (*Manila Times* and *Independent*, *ut supra*), that Bishop Hevia Campomanes, of the Diocese of Nueva Segovia, who was held prisoner by the insurgents in the Kagayan Valley in 1898 and 1899, conferred upon him authority to perform the duties of a bishop in that Diocese, that his general authority over the native priests in the province when acting as "military chaplain" under Aguinaldo was recognized, and that he was used as an agent by Archbishop Nozaleda at Manila. Some negotiations between the Spanish Archbishop and the insurgent camp is evident as Aglipay was not excommunicated until the first quarter of 1899 notwithstanding his assumption of power. However, a decree of Aguinaldo of October 26, 1898, denied recognition of appointments to parishes made by

lowing month, he is said to have been appointed ecclesiastical governor of his Diocese by Bishop Hevia Campomanes, then held as a prisoner in the hands of the insurgents.²¹ At any rate, whether he were legally appointed or not, Aglípay daily arrogated to himself greater authority over the native clergy.

Events in the political field added a new factor, or at least gave a changed direction to affairs in the Philippines. On December 10, 1898, was signed the Treaty of Paris, by which Spain yielded to the United States its sovereignty in the Archipelago. This instrument having once been signed, Spaniards in the Philippines, either lay or ecclesiastical, could no longer legally oppose the United States forces or policy. There was, therefore, no longer any reason for a rapprochement between the Spaniards and the revolted Filipinos. By the terms of the treaty, Spanish forces were immediately to be withdrawn from the Archipelago. Peninsular Spanish subjects might remain in the Philippines under the protection of the same laws as other foreigners. In case they chose to remain, they could preserve their allegiance to Spain by making declaration to that effect before a court of record within one year after the date of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty; but if no such declaration were made they were to be considered as having renounced their Spanish allegiance and to have adopted that of the Philippines. The one article of the treaty which touched upon religion was to be of immense import in the Philippines. It was a mere declaration that "The inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion." The treaty was ratified by the Senate on February 6 by a majority of only two votes over the necessary two-thirds.²²

Nozaleda, so that the understanding certainly did not carry very far, in benefits conferred at least. See LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*, i, 318, 319.

After the Americans had entered Manila, and with relations between them and the Filipino army growing more strained daily, it would be very logical for the Spaniards to hope for coöperation from the Filipinos against the invaders; and, given the close connection between State and Church in the Philippines, it would be natural for the ecclesiastical officers to attempt to further such a policy. This policy did apparently lead Nozaleda to wink at infractions of Church discipline and for the sake of future gains connive with the insurgents up to a certain point. But as a matter of fact, he was not the equal of Aglípay in astuteness and bungled matters on all sides. On the whole Nozaleda was not a strong man, and cannot be said to have been a worthy follower of the great Bishop of the Philippines, Domingo de Salazar, who was also a Dominican.

²¹ See *ante*, note 19.

²² See this treaty in various publications of the United States; and in MAXIMO KALAW, *The Case for the Filipino* (New York, 1916), Appendix A, pp. 249-250.

The negotiations in Paris had been closely watched by the Filipino insurgent leaders who had vainly endeavored to intervene therein. The signing of the treaty meant the downfall of their hopes for an immediate independence. As a consequence, relations between the United States forces and the insurgents, none too good at any time, became more strained, and it was easy to predict the ultimate rupture—a break made all the more certain because the insurgent leaders had been deluded with the hope that public opinion in the United States would at the last decide in their favor. On February 4, two days before the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, the threatened insurrection against the United States broke out.²³

No longer could the revolt be rightly called a protest against the Spanish friar, for while by the terms of the treaty the friars might remain in the islands, freedom of worship was, as seen above, specifically provided for, and the friar organizations were automatically barred from the political field, and their members no longer had any political rights other than those of lay persons. The insurrection now waged against the United States was political, and the rallying cry was "Independence" although the masses had only a very vague idea of what independence meant.

Aglipay, as above seen, remained in the insurgent camp, where the outbreak of hostilities against the United States found him, and where by reason of his natural astuteness and his religious character, he exercised considerable influence. After the capture of Malolos, the capital of the so-called Philippine republic, he accompanied the insurgent forces on their flight northward. To Aglipay is very largely due the participation of the Ilokos in the insurrection against the United States, for under the very eyes of the American forces he adroitly turned the people into the rebel ranks. Not only did he accomplish this, but he was able to collect many thousands of pesos for the insurgent cause, and finally he himself became one of the guerrilla leaders and led many forays and delivered many surprise attacks against the enemy. That he was a cause of trouble and apprehension is evident from the

²³ This period has been well covered by LEROY, *The Americans in the Philippines*. See also CHARLES B. ELIOTT, *The Philippines to the End of the Military Régime* (Indianapolis, 1916).

despatches sent to Manila by United States officers in the field.²⁴ Upon the failure of the insurrection, he was one of the last of the leaders to take the oath of allegiance to the United States.

All this has very little to do directly with the Aglipay Schism and the Filipino Independent Church, but it forms a very necessary background if one would see the roots of the schism. As soon as Aglipay had been appointed "military chaplain" of Aguinaldo's forces and vicar-general of the Archipelago, smarting, in common with the rest of the Filipino clergy, over the fact that Filipinos were not preferred or scarcely considered in the appointments to benefices, he began to assume the powers of a bishop or archbishop, and to manipulate the Filipino clergy as he wished. This assumption of power, although it was winked at for some time by Bishop Hevia Campomanes and Archbishop Nozaleda, and other acts, finally led to Aglipay's excommunication.²⁵ In March of 1899, Aglipay, quoting at considerable length from Nozaleda's famous war pastoral, rained invective upon the latter for his changed sentiments and actions now that

²⁴ See the despatches in *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1900*, part II, 329-334. Aglipay, in his article in the *Independent* (see ante), defended himself from the charge of cruelty and declared that war records in Washington prove his case.

²⁵ Aglipay was excommunicated April 29, 1899, and the sentence of excommunication was exposed from May 4 to June 5 in the archiepiscopal tribunal of Manila. The document fills three large printed pages and is entitled: "Sentence pronounced by the Ecclesiastical Tribunal of the Archbishopric of Manila in the trial against the priest of the said archbishopric, Gregorio Aglipay, for obstructing the exercise of the episcopal jurisdiction, and for various other crimes which he committed." The document recites that on November 22, 1898, Aglipay was summoned to appear, but as his address was not known the summons was without effect. Thereupon notices were affixed to the parish churches of Manila and its suburbs for ten days beginning on December 23. This likewise being without avail, peremptory summons were posted on January 9, requiring Aglipay to present himself under the penalty, in case of non-compliance, of being declared rebellious and contumacious. But this also served no purpose and the pronouncement was made. In the *expediente* drawn up against Aglipay, it was stated that on September 4, 1898, Aglipay, making use of the title "Military chaplain of the revolutionary army", and claiming plenary powers to confer with the Filipino clergy, sent a circular to the clergy in the province of Pangasinan of the Diocese of Nueva Segovia, in which he set forth that he considered it proper to appoint a provisional vicar general for the Diocese in view of the absence of the Bishop. Accordingly he made such an appointment. Also Aglipay published and distributed two circulars, October 21 and 22, respectively. The first was addressed "To the Filipino Clergy," and in it he attributed to himself the office of military vicar general and as such drew up a set of regulations for the guidance of the clergy. The second circular was addressed "To my very dear brethren of the Filipino Clergy", and in it Aglipay explained that he had been appointed military vicar-general by Aguinaldo and advised them no longer to recognize the Spanish prelates in charge of the dioceses. Aglipay was accordingly found guilty of usurpation of power. "The two circulars . . . with their schismatic tendencies and their constant appeals to the support of the civil power are directly for the purpose of separating the Clergy of this Archbishopric and that of the suffragan Bishoprics from their legitimate shepherds." The regulations promulgated by Aglipay provided that any Filipino priest who refused to subscribe to them should not be allowed to exercise his ministry. He was accordingly declared to have incurred major excommunication.

Spain was no longer in control.²⁶ On October 23, of the same year, an ecclesiastical assembly convoked by Aglipay in Tarlac, and to which came delegates from the several dioceses, approved Aglipay's appointment by Aguinaldo as head of the Filipino church, but declared adherence to Rome.²⁷ The next move of importance was the attempt to negotiate with the Pope by direct intervention through the papal legate in Spain, Monsignor Nava de Bontifé, these negotiations being conducted by one Isabelo de los Reyes.²⁸ These came to naught, but prepared the way more fully for the schism,²⁹ and Reyes, both in his report to Agoncillo, then acting for the Filipinos as their agent in Europe, and in his paper, counseled a break with Rome.

This, however, seems not to have met with Aglipay's approval, at least not immediately. In 1901, Reyes returned to Manila, where he immediately engaged in propaganda work. It was probably very largely at his initiative that Aglipay sought an interview with the Protestant ministers in Manila in the month

²⁶ See *ante*, note 16.

²⁷ Shortly after this assembly, the insurgents were forced to retire to the northern part of Luxon.

²⁸ The Ilokano, Isabelo de los Reyes, at present an official in the Government of the Philippines, was described by Taft in a report of November 10, 1902 (see *Report of the Philippine Commission*, 1902, i, 39), as "an agitator of irresponsible and irrepressible character". LEROY, *Philippine Life in Town and Country* (New York, 1905, p. 166), says of him: "It is true that the chief agitator connected with the movement, Isabelo de los Reyes, is a hopeless craver of notoriety and a fluent but shallow demagogue, the last man one might wish to see exercising influence among his people, when their own future good is held in view. He, more than the leading clerics connected with the movement, clung with tenacity to the idea of launching it in 1902, and he has written into its *Doctrine and Constitutional Rules* a lot of fantastic ideas about Christian Socialism, being a socialist of the Latin-European school (so nearly as he knows what he is) and a free-thinker so far as religious faith or practice is concerned." See also LEROY, *The Americans in the Philippines*, i, 129; ii, 200, 215, 268. Reyes was arrested in Manila in 1897 as a dangerous person and deported to Spain, where he was held a prisoner until after the signing of the Treaty of Paris. From November 25, 1899 to June 10, 1901, he edited an anti-American paper in Madrid, called *Filipinas ante Europa*. During the time he has spent in the islands since then he has been identified with various movements, most of which he started himself. As will be seen, unless he was adroitly used by Aglipay (which may be possible) Reyes was chiefly responsible for the establishment of the Filipino Independent Church. RETANA, in *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, praises Reyes highly, but since the change of sovereignty in the Philippines, Retana, who had formerly denounced every Filipino effort and every Filipino who dared speak in favor of his people, has made a complete about-face, and his later writings are quite different, so that it is advisable to check up his information from other sources (a hasty examination of his *La Política en España* and his later *Vida y Escritos del Dr. José Rizal* is sufficient proof of this). Reyes, like many other Ilokanos, is a man of considerable initiative and force, and in many ways a likable man, but he has been accused by many Filipinos of being somewhat of a *poseur* and a demagogue.

²⁹ Reyes in his negotiations with Monsignor Nava de Bontifé attempted to gain full recognition for the Filipino clergy, offering it is said that, were this granted, the friars held prisoners by the insurgents would be liberated. The nuncio's reply, according to Reyes, was "that even should the friars be beheaded, Rome would not appoint Filipino bishops and would not even appoint a special deputy to go to examine into the capacity of our priests." See RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 351.

of August, 1901,³⁰ in order to discuss religious affairs in the Philippines. The meeting was held in the office of the American Bible Society in the walled city. Aglipay, in describing the religious situation, denounced the friars in strong terms, accusing them among other things of systematic discrimination against the native clergy, and of having created great unrest among the Filipinos. He asserted also that he intended to head the independent church movement and asked the cooperation of the Protestants,³¹ saying that his program embraced a separation from the Roman Catholic Church and the preaching of the Catholic doctrine in its purity. To his overtures the Protestant ministers cautiously replied that they could not unite with any attempt that did not make the scriptures the rule and guide in doctrine and in life, at the same time urging him to study the situation more carefully and inviting him to join the Protestant movement. They pointed out that a program simply of negation and protest would lead nowhere.³² In taking his leave, Aglipay promised to consider the matter carefully.³³ No other meeting was evidently held between the schismatics and the Protestant ministers until after the schism was launched in 1902. After the new church was actually established interviews are said to have been held with the Episcopalians under Bishop Brent, from whom advice was received on several points. Any attempts made by the Protestants, however, to guide and control the movement were not altogether successful, and it is difficult to see how success could have been assured to them, with Reyes in virtual control. It was, indeed, very largely due to their advice that a wide distribution of the Bible was made by the schismatics among the Filipinos, and their influence can perhaps be detected in several other directions. But their hope

³⁰ See HOMER C. STUNTZ, *The Philippines and the Far East* (Cincinnati, 1904), p. 489. Stuntz was for several years the Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Philippines. At the conference were present the Rev. J. C. Goodrich, agent of the Bible Society, the Rev. James B. Rodgers, senior missionary of the Presbyterian Church, the Rev. J. L. McLaughlin and Bishop Stuntz of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Aglipay and Reyes, the last of whom Stuntz describes as "a Filipino gentleman of good education and an inveterate fondness for agitation".

³¹ Aglipay had previously subscribed to Nozaleda's description of the Protestant heretics in his pastoral letter (see *ante*, note 16), and Stuntz records that he had often spoken of the Protestants as "the off-scouring of the earth." Consequently, what is described as "an indication of his intellectual hospitality" in seeking the interview is rather an indication that he was ready to continue his old tactics so strikingly shown by his shady negotiations between the Spaniards and the insurgents.

³² STUNTZ, *ut supra*, p. 490.

³³ *Ibid.* Aglipay was advised to consider the advisability of having a married clergy and of declaring against "marolatry."

that the schism might eventually prove a half-way station to Protestantism has never been realized and never could be realized. It is true that Protestantism did gain some few converts because of the schism, but these were not sufficient in number to make any great difference either one way or the other.

Reyes, meanwhile, had succeeded in organizing the first labor union in the Archipelago—an organization thought by some to be anti-American (and it probably was)—in which he attempted to put into force the socialistic theories which he had absorbed in Europe. He proposed to make use of this body in his projected break with Rome, and it was, in fact, at a meeting of the union on August 3, 1901, that the schism was proclaimed.³⁴ Without his consent, Aglipay was chosen to head the movement, and a number of bishops were appointed. Either at this time or somewhat later, Governor Taft, Dr. T. H. Pardo de Tavera, and others were somewhat arrogantly appointed as honorary officials—an honor that it is needless to say was never accepted. Aglipay promptly refused to be a party to the schism, either because he considered the time as yet immature, or because he shrank from severing all relations with Rome. When Reyes insisted by saying that the Filipinos had a right to make use of the freedom of worship clause in the Treaty of Paris, and that the recognition of the Filipino clergy was an honor, Aglipay still refused and even published a manifesto on August 20, refusing to identify himself with the movement.³⁵

He was unable to stem the tide by this act, and many of the native clergy went over to the schism, especially those of the Ilokos provinces. The creation of Pedro Brillantes as Bishop of Ilokos Norte was made a special occasion by Reyes, who served in the capacity (perhaps self-appointed) of President of the Supreme Executive Committee, and this display had a great influence on the Filipinos who thus beheld one of their race receiving the high ecclesiastical honors which they had so long desired.³⁶ Aglipay's vacillation was soon to disappear, and finally refusing the advice of the Jesuits to submit quietly to his excom-

³⁴ RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 353; LEROY in the *Independent*, April 28, 1904, lvi, pp. 953-957.

³⁵ RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 353.

³⁶ The ordination was performed by twelve priests with all possible solemnity. The question of ecclesiastical authority seems to have been brushed aside lightly by Reyes and his assistants.

munication, in the hope of obtaining pardon from Rome,³⁷ he finally threw in his lot with the schismatics by signing (October 17, 1902) the third epistle of the new church,³⁸ and nine days later, he celebrated his first Mass as Obispo Maximo³⁹ of the Philippine Independent Church in the open air near the church in the suburb of Tondo.⁴⁰

In the meantime, events of considerable importance to the Philippines had been taking place in Rome. During several months of 1902, Taft, who had been sent to Rome, conducted his memorable negotiations for the purchase of the friar estates. During these negotiations the subject of the withdrawal of the friars from the Philippines was discussed. Taft dwelt on the objection of the Filipinos to the return of the Spanish friars as parish priests, and the lack of a sufficient number of secular priests. It was therefore proposed that native, foreign, or American priests be substituted for the friars.⁴¹ To Taft's proposal, the Vatican made reply that the proposal to withdraw the friars from the Philippines within a definite fixed period could not be accepted because this would not be justified by *force majeure*, and would violate rights granted by the Treaty of Paris and involve the Holy See in a dispute with Spain. The Vatican also asked how the Pope could order the withdrawal of the friars if the United States could not lawfully do so. A promise was made, however, to introduce the clergy of other nations gradually and that the friars should not return to the parishes.⁴² A verbal promise is said to have been made to remove the friars as soon as possible from the islands.⁴³

Had Taft been able to announce definitely upon his return to Manila that the friars were to be withdrawn, the schismatic movement would probably have slackened and soon have died of inertia.⁴⁴ Notwithstanding the *éclat* with which the schism

³⁷ RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 353; and LEROY, *The Aglipay Schism in the Philippines*, in the *Independent*, April 28, 1904, lvi, pp. 953-957.

³⁸ The first two epistles were signed by Reyes.

³⁹ Episcopus Maximus.

⁴⁰ STUNTZ, *The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 490; LEROY in the *Independent*, April 28, 1904, lvi.

⁴¹ The *Independent*, May 22, 1902, liv.

⁴² The *Independent*, July 10, 1902, liv.

⁴³ The *Independent*, January 1, 1904, lvi, pp. 13-18.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

had been launched in Ilokos Norte by the "ordination" of Bishop Brillantes and at Manila by Aglipay's formal adhesion, it had already begun to dwindle very markedly through the feeling of some of its foremost clergymen that the time had now come to make peace with Rome, on account of the failure of

Filipinos of standing to identify themselves in any great number with the movement which had been engineered by recognized radicals in politics and religion, and on account, too, of the discredit attaching to the political agitator who had been chiefly instrumental in launching the new movement.⁴⁵

But Taft was unable to make any statement to this effect. Toward the end of 1902, the new Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines, Monsignor Guidi, the successor of Archbishop Chapelle of New Orleans, arrived in Manila. On December 2, he published the encyclical letter (*Quae mare sinico*) written in September by the Pope to the Filipinos. There was an immediate upheaval. There was no longer thought of an accord with Rome. The schism received new recruits every moment from all parts of the Archipelago. Now the Independent Church received the impetus that was to bind it together and give it the force that might make it a serious antagonist of Mother Church. Filipinos, on finding that there was no hint in the letter of a withdrawal of the friars, declared that they were being fed once more on promises of secularization which would never materialize. They saw in the letter, indeed, as was said, only an intention on the part of the papacy to fasten the friars upon them forever.⁴⁶ Guidi's appointments of American bishops to take the place of the former Spanish prelates,⁴⁷ as well as his other efforts to please the Filipinos, had little effect, for the idea of nationalization of the clergy was fast rooting itself, and in the heat of the moment many, who in calmer moments would have hesitated to come to the breaking point, now threw off allegiance to Rome and joined the schism. Some slight consideration of the letter will not be out of place here.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ LeRoy, *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 164.

⁴⁶ LeRoy (*Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 164) calls the publication of the letter a political mistake.

⁴⁷ Aglipay expressed the general feeling when he said (*Independent*, October 29, 1903): "We resent the sending of French, Italian, Hottentot, American, or any other friar-controlled priests to rule us."

⁴⁸ It is given in full in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, for April, 1903 (xxviii, pp. 372-379). See also LeRoy in the *Independent*, January 1, 1904, lvi, pp. 13-18. LeRoy says that this letter was too often ignored or interpreted too optimistically.

In his introduction, Pope Leo XIII congratulated the Philippines on the fact that

the change which the fortunes of war have wrought in civil matters . . . has affected religion also; for when the Spanish yoke was removed the patronage of the Spanish kings ceased, and as a result the Church attained to a larger share of liberty, ensuring for everyone rights which are safe and unassailable.

The first and second of the twelve sections in the letter created four new suffragan bishoprics, which were to be included in the Archbishopric of Manila, and the next two sections provided for the proper ecclesiastical chapters for all sees and the government of vacant sees.⁴⁹ Section five concerned the secular clergy, the letter ordering that the number of the native clergy must be increased by the several bishops, but extreme care should be exercised in their appointment, and they were to be men of piety and character and worthy the trust of spiritual charges. Those who proved most efficient were to be gradually given the more responsible posts. Priests were enjoined not to mix in party strife, and in a very special manner not to become involved in worldly affairs. Complete harmony should prevail among all, seculars and regulars, this to be further incited by means of occasional synods convened by the bishops, while the triennial retreat was counseled as an efficacious means for preserving priestly fervor.

The next section advised that each diocese have its own conciliar seminary, the administration of which was to be entrusted by the bishop "to one of the clergy, whether secular or religious, who is distinguished for his services and experience in governing, and for holiness of life." Students for the seminaries were to be selected with care, and some of the best men were to be sent to Rome for education there. The Holy See, it was promised,

will do its share in the most effective way to advance the secular clergy in higher learning and better ecclesiastical training so that, in good time, it may be worthy to assume the pastoral charges now administered by the regular priests.

⁴⁹ It was enjoined that there should be a College of Canons attached to the Metropolitan Cathedral of at least ten persons, whose support was to be provided for by the Apostolic Delegate. In case the suffragan sees found it impossible to have a College of Canons, each bishop was to have consultors in their place, who should be men of piety, learning, and practical experience and who should be chosen either from the regulars or seculars. This section was objected to strenuously by the Filipinos, who said that all such consultors would be friars.

Section 7 praised the Dominican University of Santo Tomás (founded in 1610) in high terms and confirmed it as a pontifical institution of equal rank to other pontifical universities. The next section had to do with the regular clergy, and was as follows:

Yielding to the opportunities of the new order of things in that region the Holy Apostolic See has decided to make suitable provision for the religious men who look to a manner of life proper to their Institute, devoted entirely to the duties of the sacred ministry, for the advancement of public morality, the increase of Christianity and other peaceful intercourse. We commend earnestly, therefore, to the members of the Religious Orders to discharge holily the duties which they have assumed when pronouncing their vows, "giving no offense to any man". We command them to keep their rule of cloister inviolably; and wish therefore that all should be bound by the decree issued by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, July 20, 1731, which Clement XIII, our predecessor confirmed by Apostolic letters *Nuper pro parte*, August 26, the same year. The rule and boundary of the cloister are those which are laid down in another decree issued with the approbation of Pius VI by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, August 24, 1780. For the rest, the Religious who labor in the Philippines must remember to treat with great reverence and honor those whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God; and bound together with the secular clergy by the closest ties of concord and charity, let them hold nothing more pressing than to work hand in hand, throwing all their energy into the work of the ministry and the building up of the body of Christ. Furthermore, to remove every element of dissension, we wish that in the Philippine Islands the constitution *Fernandis* of Benedict XII, dated November 6, 1744, and the other *Romanos Pontifices*, May 8, 1881, in which we decided certain points in dispute between the Bishops and Missionary Regulars in England and Scotland, be observed.

By section 9, the Bishops, after conferring with the superiors of the several orders, were to determine those parishes that were to be given to regulars; and any question that could not be settled privately was to be referred to the Apostolic Delegate. The next section provided for missions and advised that it was desirable that one house with capacity for eight religious men be founded in each province. These men should be obliged to visit the towns and villages in order to exhort the people to better life. Mission stations were in time to become Prefectures or Vicariates-Apostolic. This section also provided for the collection of alms. The last two sections enjoined obedience to ecclesiastical discipline and reverence for those in authority.

The letter was criticised from one end of the Philippines to the other as being pro-friar and as giving no relief to the Filipinos. Guidi, who was a man of great good sense, counseled that the wishes of the people be met so far as possible, but he was unable to stem the tide of revolt aroused again by the letter. The excitement caused by the formal launching of the schism, great as it had been, was not equal to that brought about by the resentment against the letter and the fear lest friar rule be once more established. The consequence was that many who would have nothing to do with the schism before now embraced it eagerly, and it grew rapidly. In Ilokos Norte, there were only three priests who held out with their congregations.⁵⁰ It is asserted, however, that no priest joined the movement unless followed by his congregation.⁵¹ Aglipay claimed over 3,000,000 adherents,⁵² but this number is altogether too high. LeRoy,⁵³ with more conservatism, and probably with far more correctness, places the number at about 2,000,000; while Stuntz⁵⁴ places it at only about 1,500,000. The governor at Malolos said that 80 per cent of the people of his province were Roman Catholics and the remainder Aglipayans and Protestants.⁵⁵ As a matter of fact, most of the people were loyal to Rome, but were hostile to the friars and joined the movement as a protest against what they felt to be an injustice or because they simply followed their leaders. Devins observed that the chief success of the movement lay in towns where the priest and the people were not on good terms, and thought that the personal feeling entered largely into the matter of secession.⁵⁶ It was claimed that as many as 200 Filipino Roman Catholic priests went over to the schismatic church,⁵⁷ and this is probably not far from correct, for the new organization made a powerful appeal to the growing feeling of nationality and personal ambition. The movement was Filipino throughout and Filipinos who refused to join the schism were called unpatriotic, with the result that many who had little or no

⁵⁰ STUNTZ, *Philippines and the Far East*, p. 491.

⁵¹ H. PARKER WILLIS, *Our Philippine Problem* (New York, Holt, 1905), p. 212.

⁵² *Independent*, October 29, 1903.

⁵³ *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 165.

⁵⁴ STUNTZ, *Philippines and the Far East*, p. 492.

⁵⁵ JOHN BANCROFT DEVINS, *An Observer in the Philippines* (Boston, 1905), p. 80.

⁵⁶ *An Observer in the Philippines*, p. 80.

⁵⁷ LEROY, *ut supra*, p. 165.

religious concern gave it their adherence.⁵⁸ It is easily seen how the national sentiment might make officials apprehensive of another armed revolt, but as a matter of fact, danger from this source was never very great, although many of the rising party of Nationalists belonged to the new church.

The movement was lacking in one very great essential. It was without any great, compelling moral or religious force. Indeed no great demands of a religious or moral nature were made upon those who joined it, and this easy program brought many adherents. The general average of morality among the native Filipino clergy during much of the Spanish regime was not high. The American clergy has succeeded in introducing a far higher standard than prevailed before. While Aglipay himself has never been accused of immorality, he failed to set up a moral standard either for the priests of his church or for the people. The cockpit, gambling and other vices were allowed free course both among clergy and laymen.⁵⁹ Young priests were ordained "with somewhat startling ease and carelessness in the seminaries" opened by the schismatics, and fitness was not always considered a requisite, either in training or in character.⁶⁰

Not only was this so, but the church was built on a false foundation, for while the printed rules and other published material gave the organization a far different setting than that possessed by the faith its adherents had abandoned, in actual practice the ritual has remained the same, the Mass, indeed, being "adopted in its entirety as celebrated by the Romanists",⁶¹ although beliefs as announced are at wide variance with the teachings of the Church. The doctrines of the new church were set forth by one of its prominent members, who was probably none other than Reyes himself, as rationalistic and conforming rigorously to the

⁵⁸ STUNTZ, *ut supra*, p. 490.

⁵⁹ STUNTZ, *ut supra*, p. 494. AMBROSE COLEMAN, O. P. (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905) says that "neither clergy nor laity know what they believe and are drifting."

⁶⁰ LE ROY, *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 165; JOHN FOREMAN, *The Philippine Islands* (New York, 1906), p. 606.

⁶¹ *Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente* (Manila, Imprenta-Tipografia de Modesto Reyes y Cia, 1904), p. 13. REV. AMBROSE COLEMAN, O.P. (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905), says: "The real absurdity is that the Aglipayans, while denying fundamental doctrines and rejecting the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, keep up all the Roman ritual, cultivate modern devotions, practice the cult of the saints, and carry their statues in procession, pray for the dead and offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Their actions do not accord with their speech. They denounce in public what they themselves publicly practice."

results of modern science.⁶² Darwinism was accepted and harmonized with the biblical doctrine. The Trinity was denied, but a belief expressed in the Trinity of attributes and names. The explanation of this idea accepted by the new church was said to be entirely new and peculiar to the church itself. All this was said to be based on scriptural text plus rationalistic writings. The doctrine of original sin was denied, as well as the view that such sin was expiated through Jesus Christ; although it was maintained that Jesus Christ's sacrifice redeemed humanity from its own errors, weaknesses, and passions by means of divine attributes and inimitable example, but not by the actual material sacrifice. In its rules and constitution, the schismatic church, said this informant, aimed to establish the more pure democracy and common holding of wealth which Jesus Christ preached and the Apostles practiced—this being clearly part of the socialistic tenets foisted in by Reyes. The veriest layman can readily understand the contradiction between such sentiments and the taking over of the Mass as celebrated in the Catholic Church. This was part of the false basis on which the church was builded, for the practices of the organization said one thing and the declaration of principles another. But it is probably a fact that in very few instances was there any conception among the members of the church or of the priests other than those of the teaching of Rome. There was no frank attempt, so far as can be seen, to make expressed beliefs and practices harmonize. Thus expressed beliefs were in some instances more at variance with the tenets of the Catholic Church than are the doctrines of any other Christian church, yet Aglipayans could at any time go back to the old Church and scarcely know the difference so far as actual practices were concerned. There was often a glib juggling of ecclesiastical words and phrases that sounded loudly but meant little.

Much of the published material of the church is an attempt to set forth the peculiar views of the chief founder, but it is doubtful whether he himself, in many instances, could give a satisfactory explanation of what has been written and compiled. The haste with which much of the material was put together, and lack of scholarship and proper foundation, account for its

⁶² WILLIS, *Our Philippine Problem*, p. 209.

curious and often amusing and contradictory ideas. Among the most interesting of the published material of the organization are the six epistles, the first two of which were signed by Reyes and the last four by Aglipay. The first epistle, dated September 29, 1902, was addressed to the bishops-elect of the new church and outlined the method of episcopal consecration to be followed.⁶³ The next epistle of October 2, was a reply to Bishop Alcocer, who had denounced the schism. In it strong protest was made to the bringing in of foreign priests and the education of a Filipino clergy advocated. That of October 17 was a declaration of principles, in which it was stated that "we have separated from Rome not only through the very human question of the expoliation of the Filipino clergy in ecclesiastical dignities and possessions, but also and chiefly through the imperious necessity of reëstablishing the worship of the only true God in all its splendor and the purity of His most holy word", while various beliefs and practices of the Roman Catholic Church were condemned. Parts of this epistle were embodied in the *Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales*. The fourth epistle (October 29, 1902) advised the formation of various organizations in each province and municipality, and emphasized the need of priests. Efforts were to be made to gain possession of churches, parochial buildings, and cemeteries, of which Filipinos were the legitimate owners, and new churches should be built. Excommunications by Roman Catholic prelates should be disregarded. The epistle of December 8, was a long attack on the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, and the last one (August 17, 1903), denounced as illogical the action of certain Roman Catholic Filipinos in the diocese of Jaro who revolted against the papal discipline but continued to acquiesce in Catholic dogma. In this epistle, which was signed by Aglipay and thirteen bishops, Aglipay took occasion to review the short history of the schism. He declared

Our church is Catholic, that is, universal, because it is in reality profoundly cosmopolitan by conviction and sentiments, considering all men, without distinction, as Sons of God, and takes the name "Filipino Independent

⁶³ Of the new church and its attitude toward consecration, DEVINS (*An Observer in the Philippines*, p. 254), says: "Aglipayanism is spectacular rather than substantial. A deposed priest styling himself Archbishop, and placing other priests in bishoprics, is amusing rather than edifying. Apparently, the man, while dead in earnest, does not see the incongruity of assuming and transmitting ecclesiastical authority with no organized body behind him, and he goes forth armed only with uncertain power."

Church" simply to characterize this group of freemen, who within the aforesaid universality admit servitude to no one.

.....
 He who teaches doctrines contrary to those ideas that favor our liberty and our progress cannot be a good Filipino or friend of our people, for he leads us into slavery and brutishness.

Among other published writings are the following: *Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, Manila, 1904; *Oficio Divino de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, Barcelona, 1906; *Lecturas de Cuaresma para la Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, Barcelona, 1906; *Biblia Filipina*, Barcelona, 1908 (published in parts but never finished); *Calendario de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente para . . . 1908* (perhaps an annual publication). The second and fourth are compilations, etc., by Reyes, and are very curious publications, well worth examination if one cares to see what was gravely handed out to the adherents of the new church as of the deepest concern for the rule of life and conduct. The first is, as its title indicates, a book of rituals, and contains selections from the scriptures with elucidations, etc.; and the second, so far as published, is a treatise on the creation and on the origin of religion. Of all the writings, the *Doctrina* and the epistles (published in one pamphlet) are the most important. In addition to the above material, Aglipay also had an official organ called *La Verdad* (the truth), for which he claimed a circulation of 10,000.

The formal launching of the new sect in Manila had aroused intense excitement, but, as seen above, an apathy was fast succeeding to the first enthusiasm. The fuel supplied by the encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII was eagerly seized upon by the leaders of the movement, and they sought in every way possible to accentuate the fear of friar domination. With the organization that had already been built up, they were able to manipulate matters very shrewdly and skilfully, and before long the Aglipay Church had received an impetus that has carried it (though with decreasing membership and influence) to the present day. They were helped by the freedom of worship ushered in with the American Government, but freedom of worship was not understood, either by Aglipayans or Roman Catholics. On the one hand the Aglipayans appealed to the Government asking that the friars be withdrawn, and on the other, the Roman Catholics asked the

suppression of the Independent Church. Taft, in his report of November 10, 1902,⁶⁴ shortly after the launching of the movement, tells how he answered these requests:

I have taken occasion to say, whenever an opportunity occurred, that the Insular Government desired to take no part whatever in the religious controversies thus arising; that it would protect Father Aglipay and his followers in worshiping God as they chose just as it would protect the Roman Catholic Church and its ministers and followers in the same rights. But that, if the law was violated by either party, it would become the duty of the government to step in and restrain such lawlessness.

And he adds with great truth:

In the heat and zeal of religious controversies, it is not always possible to prevent the followers of the movement at least from stepping beyond the law, and if the movement is to spread throughout the Archipelago, we may expect disturbances at various points.

The controversies centered, in general, on the ownership of the churches and other ecclesiastical edifices and property, and this led to Taft's so-called "proclamation of peaceable possession." The revolting congregations generally claimed the buildings and property on the ground that they belonged to the people because they had been built by their labor. Aglipay declared that the Filipinos distinguished between the land acquired for cultivation and the church buildings and convents; and that it was not a question of the ownership of lands acquired with good title. But the churches and convents, he said, were the indisputable property of the Filipinos. One of the Filipino arguments was as follows:

Every dollar of money was collected by the Government of Spain by taxing the people to erect the churches, and the labor was done by *polista*, each person being compelled by the Government to work fifteen days or pay the equivalent. There is not a human being in possession of his senses, knowing the facts, who would suggest that because the Roman Catholic priests were servants of the State that therefore State property belongs to an Italian in Rome. Rome never put a dollar into the parish buildings.⁶⁵

That is, the argument amounted to saying that because the Spanish Crown had exercised the royal patronage in ecclesiastical affairs in the Philippines, that patronage descended to the United States by the transfer of the rights of Spain to the latter country—an argument that is absurd because the Constitution

⁶⁴ *Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission*, i, p. 39.

⁶⁵ *Independent*, October 29, 1903.

of the United States expressly forbids governmental intervention in religious matters. At times the Roman Catholic prelates and priests allowed themselves to be carried beyond the bounds of prudence in excess of zeal; and the same was equally true of the party of the Independent Church.⁶⁶

It was early settled that the only recourse of either party in the controversy lay in the courts. An opinion handed down by the solicitor general, December 9, 1902, on the question of the "ownership and possession, under canonical law, of chapels erected in barrios, for the celebration of mass by a priest of the Roman Catholic Church at stated intervals" was as follows:

The chapels referred to in the present inquiry, although erected for the benefit of the residents of the respective barrios, from the fact that they are open to the public, are unquestionably entitled to be considered as public oratories. As such, they are sacred ecclesiastical places. Their ownership, according to the commonly accepted opinion of canon law writers, vests in the Roman Catholic Church of the Philippine Islands, their administration pertaining to the priest or Catholic minister appointed by the bishop, subject to the supervision of the said bishop, and to the eminent domain of the Roman pontiff. All this is without prejudice to any right of patronage that may have been acquired. The priests who administer said chapels have the right of possession thereof, and the holding of the keys by a patron or other person is not a possession adverse to that of the administrator, but, on the contrary, is a right exercised in behalf of said administrator or of the Catholic Church.⁶⁷

And on the 23d of the same month, another opinion was handed down on the following matter:

A parish priest in actual possession and actually administering a parish church of the Roman Catholic Church, leaves the Roman Catholic communion and joins the Independent Filipino Catholic Church, remaining in possession of the parish church and refusing, in obedience to the orders of the Catholic Bishop of the diocese, to yield possession to a newly appointed priest of the Roman Catholic Church directed to act as parish priest and to take possession of the church.

Is it the duty of the Civil Governor, or of the provincial governor, or of some executive officer of the peace of the pueblo, on demand of the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, to put the new priest having the authority of the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in possession of the parish church, or must the Bishop appeal to judicial proceedings to dispossess the apostate priest and secure possession of his new agent, the new parish priest of the Roman Catholic Church?

In answering this question, the solicitor-general said:

⁶⁶ See *Independent*, April 28, 1904; STUNTZ, *The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 495; and AMBROSE COLEMAN, O.P., in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905.

⁶⁷ *Official Gazette* (Manila, 1902), p. 6.

In the present case there is a controversy between the schismatic priest and the Roman Catholic Bishop with respect to the possession and consequent administration of the parish church. The former claims the right to remain in possession of and to administer the parish church in the name of the Filipino Independent Catholic Church, the said Church believing itself to have the right to said parish church by the change of belief of the priest and the parishioners; and the latter claiming that the parish church as the property of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands, should continue to have such character the schismatic priest, therefore, having no right to continue in the possession and occupancy of said church, and claiming the right to appoint a priest of the Roman Catholic faith in substitution of such schismatic priest.

The determination of such a function is not a matter of the executive power. Its determination comes within the province of the Courts of Justice by reason of their functions. To deprive the schismatic priest of the possession of the parochial church, and deliver such possession to the new Roman Catholic priest, would imply an examination of the question as to which of the contending parties has the right to the possession and administration of each parochial church, and a decision that such right belongs to the Roman Catholic Bishop—functions purely judicial not executive.

Article 46 of the Civil Code still in force in these islands provides that: "Every possessor has a right to be respected in his possession; and should he be disturbed therein, he must be protected or possession must be restored to him by the means established in this law of procedure." This provision protects the possession, and refers, not only to the civil possessor, that is to say, he who is in possession as owner, but also to the natural possessor, or he who is simply the holder of a thing. Further, the provision refers principally to the possession in fact, and against the disturber of such possession, and the Law of Civil Procedure formerly in force in these Islands provides the remedy of injunctions, summary trials, which were held and decided solely upon the fact of possession.

Continuing, the solicitor-general, based his opinion upon two precedents handed down by the attorney-general of the United States,⁶⁸ and concluded by saying:

In view of the foregoing considerations, I am of the opinion that it would not be proper for the Executive to intervene in the question at issue. The Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church must appeal to the courts in support of his claim.⁶⁹

These opinions furnished a basis for Taft's proclamation of peaceable possession. In his report of November 10, he said:

Most of the churches in the Philippine Islands were built by the labor of the people of the respective parishes and devoted to the Roman Catholic Church;

⁶⁸ The first was an opinion handed down on October 11, 1838, in regard to the capture of a ship owned in the United States, which was captured as a blockade runner but which escaped to New Orleans; restoration to capture was demanded of the Executive of the United States by the blockading nation. The second, dated November 3, 1843, was a demand made by the owner of an abducted slave. In each case it was stated that the Executive could not restore possession. See *Opinions of the Attorneys General* (U. S.), iii, p. 377, and iv, p. 269.

⁶⁹ *Official Gazette*, for January 7, 1903, p. 7.

but the people have a sense of ownership, and when a majority separate themselves from the Roman Catholic Church and accept a new faith, it is difficult for them to understand that they have not the right at once to dispossess the priest of the Roman Catholic Church and place in custody and use of the edifice their newly made curé. In order to prevent constant recurrence of disturbances of the peace I have had to take a firm stand with the leaders of the movement by impressing upon them that forcible dispossession of a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, for years in peaceable possession of the church and rector's house, is contrary to law, and would be prevented by the whole police power. The leaders of the movement assure me that they have no desire to violate the law and wish to keep within it, but that their followers at times are hard to control. I have said to them that if they claim title to the churches, they may assert it through the courts, and if successful, will secure not only the confirmation of their title but actual possession.⁷⁰

There was more or less disturbance throughout the islands because of the Aglipayans' attempts to take possession of the churches, and the demands of the Roman Catholic Church for their restoration. This led at times to unseemly strife, but the matter was greatly simplified by Taft's proclamation.⁷¹ On the whole, the propaganda of the schismatics has been kept within the law,⁷² and the Roman Catholics by their recourse to the courts have received back most, if not all, of their churches. In consequence of the necessity of appeal to the courts, the schism diminished greatly, and since with the lapse of time, the fundamental reasons that lay at the bottom of the schismatic church became weakened, the institution has continued to diminish in numbers and importance, and is becoming an incident.⁷³

⁷⁰ *Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission*, ii, p. 39.

⁷¹ After Aglipay had celebrated his first Mass, the women of the church of Pandacan, a suburb of Manila, locked their priest out of the church and refused to give up the keys to the Roman Catholics. Aglipay on the invitation of the women celebrated Mass in the church. Taft sent for Aglipay's counsel whom he informed of the unlawful action of the women, and directed that possession be yielded to the proper owner. The women refused to deliver the keys to the owner, whereupon, Taft held an interview with the leaders and ordered them to hand him the keys. This they did with the remark that they would give them to the Governor but not to the fraile. It was after this event that the opinions cited above were handed down, and may have had their origin from this event. *Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission*, i, p. 39.

Of the proclamation of peaceable possession, STUNTZ (*The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 491) says that it was issued with perfect justice and consummate adroitness. Its operation "quieted public clamor, and trouble was averted".

⁷² LEROY, *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 166.

⁷³ See the *Hearings before Committee on Insular Affairs* on "Catholic Church Claims in the Philippine Islands," held January 16, 20-23, 1908, in the House of Representatives (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1908); and the *Congressional Record*, 60th Cong., First Session, February 14 to March 7, 1908 (Vol. xlii, Part 3). The history of the schism was brought out by the questions of the committee. See especially, the decision of the Supreme Court of the Philippines on the appeal from the decision of Barlin vs. Ramirez, by which the right of the Roman Catholic Church to church edifices constructed originally for the use of the communicants of the Roman Catholic Church was affirmed. The case had been first brought in the court of First Instance in 1904 and the decision of the Supreme Court of the Philippines was made in November of 1906. This case had considerable influence in the decrease of the ranks of the Independent Church. See also *Independent*, January 3, 1907.

There has been an attempt in the above pages to show how and why the Aglipay Church came into existence, and to tell something of its history. Due in large part to hostility toward the friar orders, a hostility, moreover, carefully fostered in the masses by the leaders, the new church became a protest against abuses real and fancied. The political element in the organization was not small, for the church was in great part an expression of the growing feeling of nationality. Its spiritual force has been slight, and its moral demands very few.⁷⁴ The leaders of the schism flirted with the ministers of the Protestant churches, who while extremely cautious about endorsing the project of the Independent Church, had hopes that Protestantism might have a great impetus because of the schism—a hope that has not been realized although some indirect returns were received.⁷⁵

The schism has been of benefit to Catholicism in the islands. It did cause a greater effort on the part of those who worked for the regeneration of religion,⁷⁶ and today the Roman Catholic Church is in a better position because of the Filipino Independent Church. The Roman Catholic Church has had the good fortune to have some men in the Philippines who have had the sympha-

⁷⁴ This was well understood by the Protestants. STUNTZ (*The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 495), says: "I am not without hope that Aglipay will yet take a more advanced spiritual and moral ground."

⁷⁵ STUNTZ (*The Philippines and the Far East*, pp. 494, 495), says: "The Aglipay movement helps the Protestants by detaching tens of thousands from nominal connection with the Church of Rome. Our preachers get a hearing with them, and thousands of them accept the word and are saved. . . . These people would never have left the Roman Catholic Church to become Protestants, feeble as was the hold of the Church upon them; but once outside and hungry for spiritual food, they hear and are saved. Aglipay loosens the fruit from the tree, and we gather it." DEVINS (*An Observer in the Philippines*, p. 211), in an interview with Aguinaldo, asked him what he thought of Aglipay's work. Aguinaldo replied that he considered it a step in the right direction, but a movement only of the second grade. In time the movement would become first grade and lead into the Protestant Church. It is not an uncommon Filipino characteristic to say the things one wishes to hear.

⁷⁶ Of the movement, STUNTZ says (*ut supra*, p. 488): "Whatever may be the future of the movement it has rent the old church in twain from top to bottom and now holds the attention of Catholic leaders to a far greater degree than Protestantism, for the reason that just now it is more to be feared by Catholic leaders than Protestantism." He says also (*ibid.*, p. 496): "The Independent Philippine Church has come to stay. Just how strong a hold it will be able to keep on the multitudes which have flocked to the standard of revolt against the pope cannot be foretold. But it may be reckoned with as a permanent factor in the religious future of the Philippines." See also LEROY, *Independent*, January 1, 1904, and *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 164. REV. AMBROSE COLEMAN, O.P. (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905), predicted that "It may go on for a time in its blundering way, but eventually the more intellectual of its members will drift into atheism and the bulk of those whom it gains among the common people will fall back into the practices of heathenism from which they were weaned by the Spanish friars." Father Coleman was unduly pessimistic. The obvious direction for the majority of the Aglipayan communicants to take if they leave the Independent Church is back to the old church which they had formerly known. Such a course as that predicted by Father Coleman would mean that the more than three centuries of Spanish religious tutelage had been of no effect. He himself said that Aglipay, even after his break with Rome, still believed all Rome's teachings, and he was probably correct.

thetic nature requisite for the task before them—such an one was the late Archbishop—and these zealous servants have been able to accomplish much good work. Some of the men sent over, as is natural, have not left there an altogether grateful remembrance among the people. There is a rare opportunity for the Roman Catholic Church to accomplish work of a high order among the Filipinos, who are of an exceedingly ideal temperament, but the greatest of care must be exercised and the greatest of sincerity be always manifest. Those who know the Philippine Islands need not be told that what has happened there once may happen again. The schism has died down largely because the conditions that fostered its rapid growth have either changed or lost in importance. Given an occasion, it might easily be revived, and this notwithstanding the careful work of Church leaders of the last decade and a half.

JAMES A. ROBERTSON, *Managing Editor,*
The Hispanic American Historical Review,
Washington, D. C.